DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 807 RC 014 569

AUTHOR	Noggle, Nelson L.; And Others
TITLE	The Evaluation of California's Migrant Education Program. Summary of the Study.
INSTITUTION	RMC Research Corp., Mountain View, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
REPORT NO	AMC-UR-470
PUB DATE	8 May 81
NOTE	64p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Advocacy; Basic Skills; Community Involvement; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; Government Role; Leadership; *Migrant Education; Parent Participation; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; State Action; *State Programs; Summative Evaluation; Supplementary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

A 2-phase study provided summative information on the status of the statewide implementation of California's federally funded migrant program and also provided confidential formative information to program participants at district, regional, and state levels. Guided by an advisory panel, phase I was conducted in 1980-1981 and covered all grade levels of the migrant program as well as parent and community involvement. It focused primarily on implementation at the district level and policy at all levels. Formative information was gathered through participant interviews, document reviews, and site visits to 13 districts chosen for a unique combination of characteristics. Summative information included state data on enrollment, policy, and student achievement, and questionnaire responses from district level personnel, parents, and students. The study revealed a dedicated staff at all levels but an ineffective partnership of migrant and non-migrant personnel and a confusion over program ownership in many districts. The study also revealed the need for the program, especially its advocacy aspects, and the need for leadership at the state level. Respondents indicated that the program has many successes which go unheard while also agreeing that the program should be improved. Conclusions and recommendations in 15 areas are included. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE EVALUATION OF CALIFORNIA'S MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

ED239807

RMC Report No. UR-470

Nelson L. Noggle
Lisa D. Friendly
Hisauro A. Garza
Héctor Nava
Fred S. Weiner

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May 8, 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared for
California State Department of Education,
Office of Program, Evaluation, and Research

RC014569

RMC Research Corporation
A Subsidiary of Kappa Systems, Inc.
2570 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040
Other Offices:
1501 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209
400 Lafayette Road, Hampton, New Hampshire 03842

RMC Report No. UR-470

THE EVALUATION OF CALIFORNIA'S MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Nelson L. Noggle
Lisa D. Friendly
Hisauro A. Garza
Héctor Nava
Fred S. Weiner

May 8, 1981

Prepared for
California State Department of Education,
Office of Program, Evaluation, and Research

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	ii
Introduction	1
Methodology	3
Overview of Results	6
Conclusions and Recommendations	12
1. Supplementary Instruction	12
2. Supplementary Secondary Instructional Services	21
3. Secondary Education Pupil Personnel Services	24
4. Staff Development	26
5. Needs Assessment	30
6. Utilization of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)	31
7. Identification and Recruitment	34
8. Parent Involvement	35
9. Health and Supportive Services	38
10. Monitoring and Review (MAR)	39
11. Interstate and Interagency Coordination	42
12. Fund Allocations	44
13. Information and Dissemination	46
14. Mini-Corps	48
15. Recommendations Regarding Organization, Policy and Adminstration	49
Appendix	57

Preface

The evaluation team wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the many migrant and non-migrant educators, migrant students, and migrant parents who participated in this study. The team also wishes to thank the study's Advisory Panel for their dedicated and rigorous guidance during the study. The results reported in the summary, and in the final report, would not have had the authenticity or scope they have, without the participation of these groups.

The team found that migrant education in California is generally being conducted by extremely hardworking people, dedicated to improving the education given to migrant students. There was ample evidence indicating that these people try to provide the educational services stipulated under migrant education guidelines. In addition, the assessed achievement of migrant students substantiates the need for those services. Therefore, the program, and its advocacy for the migrant child, should be preserved.

The majority of problems and issues uncovered during the evaluation tended to indicate effects of the organization, policy, and administration of the program upon implementation in the field. The significant exception, which is the need for greater commitment by non-migrant staff at the district level, may be more than an issue that can simply be corrected by program changes alone. Program changes, especially in the areas of awareness, training, policy, and administration, are recommended. However, ownership and teaming cannot be easily mandated; they also involve the need for voluntary action.

Throughout the study the evaluation team found that program participants were open to suggestions for improving the program. The team was continually encouraged to consider the investigation as important and needed. It is in that spirit that these findings are being reported.

One final note of appreciation is necessary. The evaluation team could not have prepared this report without the timely and expert efforts of Fran Vella, our word processing specialist. Our undying gratitude goes out to her.

Introduction

On April 4, 1980, the RMC Research Corporation of Mountain View, California, was awarded a contract by the California Department of Education to study its Migrant Education Program statewide. The study was to be conducted in two one-year phases, with Phase I occurring 1980-81, and Phase II occurring 1981-82. What follows is the executive summary of the final report to the State for Phase I.

Need for the Study

As part of a Federal requirement, the State must conduct an annual evaluation that studies the current issues pertaining to the operation of the migrant education program statewide. In the past, the operating agenices submitted their own evaluation reports, which were summarized by the State and submitted to the Federal program office. Concern over the lack of uniformity in design and intent of the regional reports, plus the Federal concern that adequate statewide information was missed, led to the State's request for this study. An outside contractor was requested in order to increase the overall objectivity of the evaluation results and to protect the confidentiality of participant input.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of Phase I was to provide summative information on the status of program implementation for migrant education statewide. It was important to describe and analyze implementation in terms of the legislative and administrative guidelines governing the program. In addition, Phase I was to provide formative feedback of a confidential nature to participants at all levels of the program (district, region, and State). The primary focus of the feedback was to be on those aspects that would help the participants improve the adequacy of the program. A secondary purpose for this formative evaluation effort was to provide enrichment to the interpretation of the summative results.

The purpose of Phase II is to evaluate the effects of the formative feedback provided under Phase I. The emphasis during this phase will be to determine the extent to which the feedback was received, used, and resulted in specific program improvements.

Scope of Phase I

The summative aspect of Phase I covered all grade levels of the migrant education program, including parent and community involvement activities. The implementation of the progrm was studied primarily at the district level; data were then aggregated and analyzed Statewide. Policy review, however, was conducted at the district, regional, State, and Federal levels.

Formative studies during Phase I were conducted in 13 different school districts, selected because each represented some unique combination of relevant characteristics. Formative studies were also conducted in each region, and in the State. The formative studies, like the summative, covered all grade levels, including parent and community involvement.

Content of Phase I

Both the summative and formative aspects of Phase I, hereafter referred to as "the study," covered the 13 major components of the California Migrant Education Program. Each component deals with unique, yet interrelated, responsibilities of the program that arise from the Federal policies. The results summarized here cover each component.

Both aspects of the study covered three operational dimensions which cut across the components: (1) policy, (2) organization, and (3) administration. Without these dimensions, implementation of the program components could not have been evaluated. The results summarized here also cover these dimensions.

Methodology

Formative Evaluation Approach

The formative studies were conducted through the process of interviewing program participants, reviewing appropriate policy documents, site plans, and meeting agendas, and observing the delivery of services. This process was followed in each site: the 13 districts, the nine regions, and the State.

District sites were selected on the basis of each being representative of a unique combination of characteristics. The major characteristics considered were as follows: (1) size of program, (2) funds per student, (3) geographic/regional location, (4) student mobility, and (5) district configuration (elementary, secondary, or unified). One of the "direct-funded" districts was added as a site. In addition, all of the regions, and the State, were selected as sites.

Aided by a semi-structured interview guide, the evaluators conducted informal interviews with key participants at each site, including both migrant and non-migrant personnel. Parents and students were interviewed as well. The confidentiality of the input received during these interviews was strictly adhered to throughout the study.

Each site was visited about three times. The first visit established rapport and site-specific evaluation plans, the second was devoted primarily to data collection, and the third was responsible for completing data collection and providing oral feedback. Feedback occurred in essentially four ways: (1) the interview questions themselves alerted participants to areas needing attention; (2) the interviews allowed for informal feedback by the evaluator, (3) there was planned oral feedback at the end of each visit, especially the third visit, and (4) each site was sent a written report. This executive summary reviews the final report to the State, which constituted both summative and formative feedback at that level.

Summative Evaluation Approach

The summative data collection was divided into three basic efforts: (1) collecting from the State any basic enumerative data and policy documents; (2) collecting from district-level personnel their responses to questionnaires; and (3) collecting from districts and the State the basic indicators of student achievement. Questionnaires were prepared for the following eight response groups: parents, students, migrant aides and health personnel, migrant resource teachers, regular classroom teachers, school principals, migrant and regular counselors, and district administrators. The questionnaires included respondents working with all grades, K-12. Three indicators of student achievement were selected: local grade-advancement information including graduation, local proficiency examination results, and results from the California Assessment Program (CAP). The grade-advancement information covered grades 3, 6, 9, 11 and 12. The proficiency exam results covered essentially grades 6, 9, and 11. And, the CAP data was for grade 3 only.

After careful consideration of the study's timelines, it was decided that the summative questionnaire data would be collected and analyzed for two school years, 1979-80 and 1980-81. Therefore, the State was essentially divided randomly into three sets of migrant districts, stratified by region. The first set of districts were to be asked about the 1979-80 school year; the second about the 1980-81 school year; and the third would be set aside as an uncontaminated group for future evaluations. The second set of districts were also asked to submit data for two indicators of student achievement.

Advisory Panel

In addition to input from the State and other formative sites, the overall design, instrumentation, and analysis activities of the study were guided by the study's Advisory Panel. Two meetings of the Panel, which included panel-members, key State personnel, consultants, and RMC staff, were held. The first was in June, 1980,

and covered design, instrumentation, and data collection issues. The second was in March, 1981 and dealt with analysis and interpretation issues. Througout the study the Panel members were asked to review drafts of the basic instruments as they became available. Members of the Panel are listed in the Appendix to this summary.

Overview of Results

Migrant education in California is a Federally-funded program aimed at assuring educational continuity for a mobile population group of children who usually have severe English-language limitations. A sincere attempt to provide that assurance was found at every level within the State's Migrant Education Program. The results, however, also tended to point to a question often found in public education: who is responsible for providing the educational services to children; and, who holds the providers accountable such that the services actually benefit the children? Despite the sincere attempts of Program staff, an effective partnership between the migrant and non-migrant personnel was not found in many districts.

The ultimate goal througout the final report and this summary is to focus on ways to improve a program that is badly needed. The results summarized here attempt to provide a general overview of the major issues, the major success stories, and the major needs. The conclusions and recommendations that follow will itemize in greater detail what was found and what may be able to be done.

Major Issues

Ownership and teaming seem to be the two most salient issues underlying the implementation of supplemental instruction to migrant children. The results summarized here point to a realization that education for migrant students takes place despite the inconsistent vibrations of bureaucratic machinery. There is ample evidence of dedicated people at the local district level trying to provide extra instructional help and other services to migrant students. The bulk of those dedicated people are paid through migrant education funds.

In contrast, also at the local district level, there is an aura of incidental awareness at best by many regular school and district staff

as to what migrant children need and whether or not they are receiving it. Despite a consistent and concentrated effort by local migrant staff, especially the coordinating resource teacher, many districts, hence many school and district staff, demonstrate little ownership in migrant instructional services other than signing a service agreement and finding locations for aides to work. This is especially true for districts in direct-service regions. There is considerable evidence of the isolation of migrant staff, such that they cannot integrate their supplemental services adequately with the regular program. Districts that are committed heavily to bilingual programs, however, seem to promote better teaming with the migrant staff.

The documents controlling the planning and funding of migrant programs are completely void of any references to a district's commitment to provide an adequate base of instruction to migrant students or to integrate the instructional planning and services of migrant education with those of their own. The coordinating migrant resource teacher is often left alone to coordinate the bureaucratic documentation of migrant recruitment, enrollments, parental involvement, health screening, and educational services without the basic support of the district, or knowledge by them, for what he or she is doing. This means that the remaining time left to the resource teacher is spent promoting the program, especially among key district and school administrators. Findings of this report, such as evidences of training needs, the need for more direction to instructional aides, or the need for better materials, are quite understandable; the key individual responsible for migrant instructional services, the coordinating resource teacher, is doing something else besides directly affecting instruction.

The regions cannot help matters, because they are at the present time carriers of State and Federal policies, responsible for making sure the MSRTS documentation contains necessary evidence to support next year's program, for deciding on the allocation of funds and resources, and for "making-up for" the limited leadership provided by

the State. Even though the regional office feels the scrutiny of the State and a strong parent contingent, it finds itself having little authority and a lot of flexibility, i.e., regions have no real authority over the districts, nor do the local education agencies in which they are housed. They cannot negotiate for greater district commitment when they basically tell the districts what they will get. Though there are some differences between direct-service and reimbursement agreements, the district finds little or no room to barter for consideration of special needs. The same is essentially true for direct-funded districts except they are more remote in terms of contact with their funding agency, the State. However, the picture in mixed regions, where some district/regional negotiation is evident, is considerably better. There is much more evidence of district ownership and teaming with migrant education.

Why does this situation exist? It starts at the State level and permeates down through the program. Leadership is the problem. The State, and this should not be limited only to the Migrant Education Section, does not drive a hard enough bargain: (1) there are no incentives in the regional applications and service agreements, (2) there is no accountability in the MAR visitations; and (3) the MAR has been too compliance-oriented, and overall evaluation or assessment practices have lacked uniformity. There are a lot of hard working people at the regional and district level, most of whom are funded by migrant education, who feel their success story is submerged under the inadequate dissemination of policy, funds, and guidance by the State. They are tired, some are scared, of hearing about how the migrant program is in jeopardy. "Why doesn't someone come out into the field, spend some time here, and see the good things we are doing for migrant children?"

Major Successes

Despite the lack of ownership and commitment on the part of many districts, there is plenty of evidence of a success story. The 20-30

migrant students assigned to each aide are being given four and five hours of supplementary instruction in the targeted skills each day. Sometimes because of the students' severe English-language limitations, it is the only instruction they can likely benefit from. In those districts where teaming between migrant and non-migrant staff occurs, the situation includes creative planning to merge the development of migrant students' skills with the progress of other students. If the classroom situation is ESL or bilingual, the situation is improved for another reason; the classroom teacher is bilingual and seems to have an added affinity for the difficulties of the students.

The vast majority of migrant and regular staff alike feel that migrant services, especially instruction, health, and parental contacts, help student achievement. While the study does not quantify the incremental effects (degree) due to migrant education, which will represent a unique challenge for future evaluations, the results from the formative study, through observations and interviews, suggest that the program enhances achievement in the targeted skills. In addition, there was a strong commitment and follow-through by migrant staff to identify and recruit other needy migrant children for the program. In other words, the program attempts to seek out needy children, and attend to those needs.

Major Needs

What this study does clarify about migrant student achievement, is that the current status of migrant children clearly demonstrates the need for a program that accomplishes the things the migrant program attempts to do. There is a need to identify these students, and to assess their needs. There is a need to remediate or develop their basic skills, and to promote their continuance in school. There is a need to assess their progress, which means that there continues to be a need to provide a program that assures continuity of services when the child moves district-to-district.

As the evaluators developed the necessary rapport in each of their sites to acquire in-depth descriptions of program implementation, it became evident that there was something special about the migrant education program. It was a program of advocacy, a program that did everything possible to identify needy children and to ensure that they would be given help under the program. Even if the local program staff encountered heavy opposition, they would work in isolation if necessary to deliver those services.

Why was there a need for such strong advocacy? The issue that began to present itself in some districts was one that extends beyond the boundaries of public education. There seemed to be a concern among district and regional staff that if money alone were sent to many of the districts, migrant children would not benefit from one cent of it. The district would merge its money with the rest and proceed as usual, paying limited attention to highly mobile minority students having English-language difficulties. Some of their concern stemmed from a sense of ethnic bias that existed in the local community or schools. Some of it originated from an historical perspective of how things were before migrant education came to the district. Some stemmed from concerns expressed to them by others. They were also concerned about their impression that district superintendents are pressured by local school boards to get as much money as possible and equitably distribute it across all students.

Why then, with this all too evident expression of student needs is the migrant education program under such upheaval? The evaluators who conducted this study were continually made aware of the local and regional effects of several important State-level activities which occurred throughout the study. At the beginning of the study, a State-level ad hoc task force report, which was extremely negative toward the operation of the migrant program, caused local and regional staff considerable concern.

Soon after the ad hoc task force report, a new Director of Migrant Education was appointed. The districts and regions, trying to recover from the report had to adjust under the administrative changes of the new Director.

Then, it was announced that a special task force had been formed, actually a series of task forces, to make recommendations for program improvement given the ad hoc task force report, and an earlier report from the U.S. Government Accounting Office. The evaluators felt almost immediate reactions from districts and regions to "await the worst." Many of those interviewed agreed with the need for program improvement, but many of them also believed that the success stories in the schools themselves were going unheard. Some felt that if they were heard, it would make little difference.

The next thing to impact the field was another change of Directors of Migrant Education. This time, an acting director was named, reporting directly to the Superintentent of Public Schools instead of to the Director of Compensatory Education. Again, initial reactions in the field tended to be neutral at best. The mounting feeling throughout the study was that the field had little respect for State leadership, and that until the State "got its act together," the districts and regions would proceed as usual.

Summary

As was mentioned a few paragraphs before, the migrant students have definite needs in terms of their basic skills. There are two aspects of the migrant education program that seem to make it imperative that the advocacy element be maintained: (1) the program identifies the needy children; and (2) the program attempts to provide educational continuity when the children move. If the program were to be successfully teamed with local districts without losing these two aspects, it seems that program services could be improved. Somehow, the State must renew itself in a leadership role and continue advocacy of the migrant program, gaining a greater district commitment for success of the program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section of the executive summary is categorized first by component, and then by the operational dimensions cutting across the components. The conclusions and recommendations reported here are identical to those listed in the overall final report. However, the evaluators encourage readers to probe more deeply into the final report, as it provides the comprehensive systmatic argumentation necessary to draw these conclusions and recommendations.

1a. Supplementary Instructional Policy

Conclusion. Two very important issues emerged during the policy review for instruction. The first was very specific; "supplementary" was never defined. As results from the study will indicate, there is a problem when staff at the local level do not know if what they do or propose to do is supplementary. The second issue is one of specificity. The only instructional plans that existed in most districts, regions, or the State were these documents. As can be seen from the excerpts presented here, those documents lacked the level of specification necessary to alert local staff, especially non-migrant staff, as to what is expected of cooperatively developed-migrant instructional services.

Recommendation. Policy documents should clarify "supplementary," especially when the students lack the skills to benefit from regular instruction.

Recommendation. Policy documents should call for more detailed plans, especially in regards to migrant/non-migrant cooperation or teaming.

1b. Qualifications of Instructional Staff

Conclusion. Certified staff, both migrant and non-migrant are educated as well as expected. There is some concern about the schooling of many of the aides.

Recommendation. In conjunction with the plans for staff development, the migrant program would probably benefit from setting qualification requirements for aides that are at least the same as those expected for graduation from high school, which includes passing local proficiency exams.

Conclusion. The migrant and non-migrant staff have adequate experience with migrant students.

Conclusion. There is more turnover of aides; the pay-scale may be a problem.

Recommendation. Each district (or region) should look into the pay-scale issues as they arise and make equitable adjustments in relation to tasks being performed by aides.

Conclusion. The need for bilingual migrant staff is apparent; however, very few districts require that migrant staff be certified bilingual.

Recommendation. The district should determine the minimum level of bilingualism needed for each staff position, and require certification in those cases where its warranted.

1c. Instructional Planning

Conclusion. The awareness of goals and objectives of migrant education is not uniform across district-level staff, especially non-migrant staff.

Recommendation. A uniform method of making migrant goals and objectives annually known to participating migrant staff is needed.

Conclusion. Migrant instruction, as a supplementary approach, has "too many bosses".

Recommendation. As part of a later recommendation for a better definition of "supplementary," it should be made clear that the district is responsible, in the final analysis, for migrant instruction.

Conclusion. Articulation of migrant instruction, K-12, is no better or worse than the district's regular articulation, except that the MSRTS is suppose to transfer migrant student records.

Recommendation. Better teaming with local district staff and improvements to the MSRTS should help with articulation K-12.

Conclusion. Teaming between migrant staff and bilingual staff is better than between migrant staff and regular district staff; however, it can be improved.

Recommendation. The State's Migrant Education Section should take a leadership role and develop cooperative plans with the State's Bilingual Program by passing guidelines for district-level teaming on to the districts.

Conclusion. Needs assessment practices of migrant education are not adequately integrated with the districts' instructional programs.

Recommendation. Uniform guidelines for integrating migrant and district instructional planning should include specifications of how migrant needs assessment processes and instruments are to be used, supplementing the districts' own needs assessment.

Conclusion. Little planning between the classroom teacher and instructional aide exists in too many districts (30%).

Conclusion. There is evidence that some districts are less committed to the instruction of migrant students than is desirable.

Recommendation. Migrant education policy changes are needed if district-level commitment is to be increased.

Conclusion. The paperwork of instructional aides appears to be a factor interfering with teacher-aide planning.

Recommendation. Reductions in paperwork, especially MSRTS, or increases in the length of an aide's day, should be considered.

Overall Conclusion. The planning that takes place between migrant staff and other staff seems to depend on the teaming that exists between them.

Overall Recommendation. The sources for improving teaming should be pursued, beginning with policies requiring district-level commitment, and ending with MAR procedures that uphold it.

1d. Description of Instruction

Conclusion. Migrant instructional aides provide most of the supplementary instruction.

Conclusion. English language arts, ESL, and math, as targeted by migrant education, are the content areas emphasized in most districts.

Conclusion. Classroom teachers and resource teachers direct the activities of instructional aides; however, the amount of direction by the resource teacher is of some concern because of their additional workload.

Conclusion. Supplementary instruction, migrant education's primary purpose for existence, actually takes place, most often in the manner expected - supplementary to the classroom teachers' instruction.

Conclusion. When the supplementary instruction was not as expected, it was generally seen as part of the teaming issue, either caused by a lack of overall commitment by the district to migrant education, the heavy workload of resource teachers, or commitment by the classroom teacher.

Recommendation. Guidelines outlining the cooperative efforts of classroom teachers, resource teachers, and instructional aides are needed; they need to be written and enforced, however, in such a way to permit local flexibility.

Conclusion. Migrant students are pulled out of classrooms for migrant instructional services more often than worked with in the classroom

Recommendation. The adequacy of the pull-out method should be determined in each instructional setting; increased commitment by the local district is needed to study pull-outs appropriately.

Conclusion. Migrant aides are often assigned to bilingual classrooms; teaming between migrant and bilingual staff is much better than between migrant and regular district staff. (No recommendation needed.)

le. Adequacy of Instruction

Conclusion. The majority of migrant and regular staff are satisfied with the adequacy of migrant supplementary instructional services.

Conclusion. A significant minority of staff, however, felt that migrant supplementary instruction interfered with regular instruction, possibly linked to the vast usage of pull-outs.

Recommendation. Justification for using pull-outs should be developed in each district such that the pull-outs do not interfere with regular instruction. There is a "Catch-22" aspect to this recommendation since there are times when a migrant student, especially a LES or NES student, does not benefit from regular instruction because of his or her severe language limitations, even if left in the classroom. This does not mean, however, that pull-outs are always the answer in these instances.

Conclusion. The migrant staff in general is qualified to provide instructional services; however, the qualifications of instructional aides are sometimes a concern, especially when the aides are asked to provide original instruction without classroom and resource teacher guidance.

Conclusion. The coordinating resource teacher in some districts is too busy to provide adequate training to instructional, or to bring about teaming between the aides and teachers.

Conclusion. One of the major reasons resource teachers are too busy is because the regular district staff are fairly uncommitted to the migrant program. Hence, they spend considerable time promoting the program.

Recommendation. The policies of migrant education need to be changed in order that the districts are uniformly committed to the program, thus allowing the resource teachers to free themselves from their advocacy role and spend more time improving instruction.

Recommendation. Resource teachers should be trained to promote teaming between aides and teachers, especially in terms of staff training, planning, and needs assessment.

Conclusion. The qualifications of instructional aides may be somewhat related to their pay scales, such that low pay does not attract the better aides.

Recommendation. Pay scales should be determined at the district level; they should be in line with the tasks being asked of the aides; and the aides should have corresponding skills in order to conduct these tasks.

Conclusion. The question of whether or not migrant education helps with student achievement cannot be answered conclusively by this study. Many migrant and regular staff perceive that it does. Achievement data collected during this study provides a baseline of the status of migrant student achievement, and illustrates that the needs of migrant

students in the basic skill areas are well below the average non-migrant student.

Recommendation. Student achievement assessment should be one of the major aspects of the migrant education program. The next evaluation study should continue to collect the information collected during this study, plus other related indicators such as attendance data. Each district and region should be encouraged by migrant policies to systematically review each year's proficiency exam, grade advancement, and attendance data as indicators of migrant student progress. To help with these assessments, the State should adopt an evaluation design which considers the length of time a student is in a program and in a district, as well as how well the student does in comparison with non-migrant students.

Conclusion. There is evidence that in some districts the materials of instruction used for migrant supplementary instruction are not satisfactory.

Recommendation. Since the migrant program is suppose to parallel the districts' regular program, it is essential that the district must be committed to the migrant program, especially if the teaming necessary to choose appropriate materials is to take place.

Recommendation. In coordination with other information and dissemination efforts, a list of accessable supplementary materials, and their correspondence with basal or ESL programs, should be given to each district. This list should be updated annually.

Conclusion. Instructional planning, including related aspects of the needs assesament process, is unsatisfactory in many districts. Lack of teaming between migrant and regular staff, due often to a lack of district commitment to migrant education, is the major cause.

Conclusion. The coordinating resource teacher is often too busy with various administrative responsibilities and program advocacy activities to be able to promote better planning.

Conclusion. The present policy documents, which are mandated by the State, remove too much of the responsibility for planning from the districts.

Recommendation. Migrant education policies should require of each district a detailed plan for how migrant instructional services will supplement regular district services, and provide a detailed description of the events necessary to promote effectual planning.

Recommendation. Efforts to improve the needs assessment process should recognize the need for effective teaming between migrant and district staff; therefore, needs assessment instrumentation should remain flexible to include district-level needs assessment information. (Special note: if the National Skills List is used with the MSRTS, the needs assessment process should be altered to make the MSRTS process a more viable part of the overall planning process.)

Conclusion. There is evidence that many of the instructional aides have an overload of paperwork, especially MSRTS paperwork. If the National Skills List is added to the MSRTS chore, aides will need even more time for paperwork.

Recommendation. Districts should consider having aides work an additional paid hour each day, at least when the paperwork is heavy.

Recommendation. The aides' and resource teachers' part in the MSRTS process, especially if the National Skills List is added, should be merged within the overall planning process, especially with the needs assessment process.

Conclusion. Other factors, such as absenteeism of aides, language problems of aides, and cultural or ethnic bias were seen as problems in a few districts.

Recommendation. These factors should be noted and investigated by each district; they all bear some relationship to the teaming problems mentioned earlier. The bias question, however, may require special investigation by the State.

Conclusion. The commitment of migrant parents to their children's education is questioned by many district-level migrant and regular staff.

Recommendation. This question is related to the overall question of parental involvement; migrant staff should remain committed to the promotion of that involvement, both in terms of Parent Advisory Councils and parent-teacher conferences.

1f. Elementary Instructional Sources

Conclusion. Very few differences were found between elementary (K-8) and overall (K-12) results. Differences of five or more percentage points were found in only 13 of the 101 questions analyzed. Looking more closely at each of the 13 differences, most of them were for the resource teacher only, with no agreement from other staff. Closer scrutiny of each question suggested that all but one of the differences was important enough to consider it more than a slight difference; and that was the one which indicated that fewer weekly planning meetings between teachers and aides were conducted at the elementary level. Therefore, the conclusions and recommendations reported earlier for overall migrant instructional services (K-12) also apply to elementary (K-8).

2. Supplementary Secondary Instructional Services

Conclusion. Much of what was reported in the section on overall (K-12) and elementary (K-8) instructional services is true for secondary.

Recommendation. The majority of the prior recommendations for instructional services are applicable for secondary.

Conclusion. The repeated reference made in the results regarding migrant supplementary instructional focus being on Engilsh and not on Spanish attempts to refute the popular notion that migrant education perpetuates students' dependence on their native language.

Conclusion. There is less bilingual education, hence, more ESL instruction and general English emphasis at the secondary level.

Recommendation. Heavy English emphasis is justifiable since high school students do not have the luxury of time for a structured, slow-paced, longitudinal, transitional program. However, it is recommended that bilingual instruction be available for students who would be unable to profit from English instruction in content areas (e.g. math, social sciencies).

Conclusion. DLI-ESL programs are being field tested in various school districts. The amount of class time required in these programs seems excessive when realizing that other subject matter is being ignored. The rationale usually given to justify these programs is that students would gain very little from regular content area instruction, because of language differences.

Recommendation. It is recommended that DLI-ESL programs not be expanded until further studies demonstrate their effectiveness. Bilingual education seems to be a better approach since it can address content areas and ESL.

Conclusion. A large percentage of secondary migrant and non-migrant staff reported that little planning takes place between aides and the regular classroom teacher.

Conclusion. A great proportion of secondary migrant and non-migrant staff consider the regular classroom teacher as the primary person who determines the migrant education instructional approach.

Recommendation. More emphasis should be placed on drawing the regular secondary classroom teacher into being part of the migrant instructional team since they are viewed as the locus of control.

Conclusion. NCES (1980) reports that 51% of Hispanic high school seniors nationwide are 18 years or younger, compared to 80% for the white senior population. Of the 19 and over seniors nationwide, Hispanics account for 49% as opposed to 20% for whites.

Conclusion. Formative data indicated that migrant students feel a responsibility to augment their family income. This finding is also supported by the NCES report.

Recommendation. Migrant programs should be designed to address the age characteristics mentioned. An effort should be made to increase the number of work study programs and the migrant student participation in vocational and technical training. However, extreme caution should be taken to ensure that migrant students are given proper counseling and effective college preparatory programs. Historically, there has been a tendency to channel migrant students into non-college programs, thus severely limiting their options.

Overall conclusions. The following paragraphs attempt to capture the sentiment and opinion of numerous people interviewed regarding migrant education. Not to report this information would be a disservice to those who confided in the evaluators and who longed for changes, both at the elementary and secondary levels.

Credit is given to those school districts who are making an earnest attempt at bettering the curriculum offerings for migrant students. Credit also goes to a multitude of individuals who, inspite of frustrations and limitations, continue their struggle, advocating for migrant students' educational rights. However, in addition to the migrant education programmatic recommendations that are made in this document there remain serious failures that seem to be beyond migrant education's reach to affect. It was frequently reported during formative interviews, that by the very nature of being migrants, these students are not seen as an authentic part of a school district's constituency. In spite of migrant's historic pattern, arriving in predictable numbers to a predictable area and at a predictable time, many school districts are habitually caught "off-guard."

According to some educators interviewed, the supplementary nature of the program gives it periphery status, undermining its authenticity, therefore its impact. The lack of program familiarity by non-migrant personnel responsible for working with migrant students has been documented in various components discussed here. The improvement of migrant students' education does not rest on lack of Federal or State legal statutes. Nor does it depend on increased research proving that improvement is warranted. For the former there is the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI; the Law vs. Nichols, U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1974; and numerous other court cases which give migrant students legal rights to educational equality. For the latter, demonstrating need, there are reports by NCES (May 1977, Feb. 1980), Exotech Systems, Inc., (1975), and countless others by the Office of Civil Rights and other independent scholars. The need remains.

Recommendations, short of restructuring the educational system, whereby accountability would go hand-in-hand with responsibility, may only result in cosmetic changes. It was asked by an educator during an interview, "Would Anglo parents tolerate their children being educated mostly by paraprofessionals and within a 'supplementary' framework?" While acknowledging the dedication of most instructional aides, this educator was quick to respond to his own question, with a crisp, unequivocal "No!"

3. Secondary Education Pupil Personnel Services

Conclusion. The need for innovative programs aimed at addressing the educational needs of migrant students has been well documented by various agencies during migrant education's history and is highlighted here with use of data from a recent NCES study.

Recommendation. It is recommended that information regarding exemplary programs or instructional practices be better disseminated. It is further recommended that research aimed at showing need for counseling services be curtailed. Research should focus instead on finding solutions and evaluating the benefits derived of applied solutions.

Conclusion. The importance of a migrant counselor in influencing a migrant student's scholastic life is unquestionably great. A bilingual counselor, with direct or indirect knowledge and experience of migrant work and migrant life style was judged to be more effective than those not having these characteristics. Because a counselor is second only to migrants' parents in influencing their academic decisions (NCES data), a counselor could be more effective if they were to inform and involve parents in all aspects of migrant counseling (academic, career, college and social/personal). Grade nine appears to be a critical juncture where a greater number of students are either retained or drop-out. This may be due to the fact that students reach the limit of compulsory education age at this level. Forty-seven percent of the students reported receiving counseling services primarily from teachers, and 30% from aides. Twenty-one percent of the secondary schools with migrant students have no bilingual counselors. Yet, 42% of migrant students prefer counseling in Spanish and another 23% bilingually.

Recommendation. It is recommended that emphasis be placed on providing appropriate counseling services by qualified counselors at the secondary level and in earlier grades, if possible. Since migrant students seem to be commonly represented in groups of 50 or less throughout California's high schools, perhaps joint migrant-regular counselor positions could be created. Without this approach or a similar one (e.g.

counselor-teacher), it is doubtful that a school could afford to hire a full migrant counselor or that qualified counselors would accept part time positions.

Conclusion. While 67% of parents report that drop outs were not caused by low grades, an average of 25% responded "don't know" to this question. Forty percent of the parents report that their children dropped out because they disliked school, while 30% claimed that the teachers disliked the students. Twenty-eight percent of the parents reported that the family needed the student to work, thus, causing him/her to drop out.

Recommendation. It is recommended that parents suggestions be taken seriously since they seem to be confirming the suggestions for improvements that were voiced during formative interviews by numerous educators. Parents are suggesting the need for better qualified teachers, special education classes, work-study opportunities, and more counseling services. They also see the need for more involvement by parents themselves.

4. Staff Development

Within the context of migrant education, staff development is designed to accomplish two ends. One is to maximize the qualifications of those hired to carry out instructional and other goals of the program. The second is to faciliate the operation of the program through promoting cooperation and understanding between regular district staff and migrant education staff. In addition to the data on this component gathered through the summative questionnaire, informative data were collected throughout the course of the formative field work. These two sources of data do tend to converge.

Conclusion. The need for staff training and development is an ongoing one, and regardless of the level of staff qualifications this need never entirely disappears. However, the data suggest that the migrant staff are considered to be well qualified at all levels within the school system. The lowest ratings of migrant staff qualifications tended to come from classroom teachers.

Recommendation. Staff training should be designed to increase the potential of migrant education staff. The emphasis of staff development should be on maximizing staff capabilities rather than insuring a minimum level of ability which, the data suggest, is already present: Aides interviewed on-site who had several years experience or were assisting with additional courses earnestly suggested that new and more advanced material be presented in the training programs they attend.

Conclusion. Resource teachers and classroom teachers vary significantly in their perceptions of the qualifications of migrant instructional aides. It is the classroom teachers who work with the instructional aides and the resource teachers who are responsible for their supervision and training. Based on data collected through both the formative and summative data collection efforts it is believed that the lower rating made of migrant staff qualifications by the teachers is as

much a function of the lack of awareness on the part of teachers about the goals and objectives of the migrant program, and the job description of the aides. It is the teachers belief that aides fall short in carrying the duties implicit in their job descriptions.

Recommendation. Communication between migrant education staff and local district staff should be improved. This is plainly evident from both the formative and summative data collected. Problems with the implementation of almost every component can be traced to such problems of communication. The local district staff, from administrators through secretaries, simply should be better informed about the goals of the program and the specific responsibilities of those who work in the program. This is especially true with regard to classroom teachers. The teachers are in many cases disappointed by the migrant program. It is believed that far too few teachers are aware of the supplementary nature of the instructional assistance provided by migrant education. This situation should be remedied if the program is to achieve its potential. A simple and possibly adequate solution would be to distribute a brief programmatic description (drawn up at the State or regional level with specific requirements and activities of the program) to every teacher working with migrant personnel. The description would be distributed at the beginning of every school year and updated frequently to reflect any relevant changes. Due to the lack of "teaming" believed to exist between many aides and teachers, such a solution would probably not be adequate. Teachers need to have a more dynamic relationship with their aides; to participate in their growth. Teachers should be surveyed as to what they believe the training needs of migrant staff to be. Teachers should be encouraged and certainly allowed to become as involved in that process as possible.

Conclusion. When asked to recommend specific content and/or logistical changes to the training provided by migrant education, a majority of respondents expressed a need for more individualized training. Based on information gathered during formative site-visits, it is considered

likely that what is being suggested is training more specifically tailored to individual needs.

Recommendation. An effort is being made in some districts and regions to determine the specific training needs of respondents. This effort should be continued and initiated in all participating districts. Those aides with more experience or training could be exposed to a different level of training than others. The training could perhaps be more specifically tailored to the instructional responsibilities of migrant staff so that new material could be learned and a high degree of interest maintained throughout the training. Earlier recommendations to decrease the administrative burden of resource teachers so they can provide more "one-on-one" time with aides should also help with meeting these individualized needs. A request regarding staff training heard quite often in the field was that training not begin anew with the basics every year. The extent to which this actually occurs is not accurately known, however it does seem to figure prominently in the respondents' evaluation of the value of the training.

Conclusion. Resource teachers and aides attending training provided by local school districts, did find the training to be moderately helpful. The response, however, was not as favorable as might be hoped. One reason for this may be the lack of articulation between the two sources of training. In contrast to the amount of input they had on the content of migrant education's staff training, migrant staff reported having relatively little input to the content of regular district training.

Recommendation. As part of the management of the local or regional migrant education program, an effort should be made to coordinate the training provided by the local district, other categorical programs and the migrant education program. Regular district staff working with migrant students should be encouraged by their own district administrators to attend training provided by migrant education. The migrant education staff should be encouraged to survey regular instructional staff about training needs, both for themselves and for migrant staff, especially aides.

Conclusion. A relatively small percentage of respondents reported that migrant education had provided an opportunity to receive academic credit for training. A smaller percentage indicated that the training provided any opportunity for job advancement.

Recommendation. Future research should probe the extent to which such opportunities for academic credit and career advancement do act as attendance incentives for active participation in staff development training.

5. Needs Assessment

Conclusion. The needs assessment process seems to take place at the local level varying in method and staff involvement. As was found with other components, there appears to be a lack of teaming between the migrant program and the other programs at the local level. What appears to be lacking in many districts, not all, was a model or well-defined process of merging the districts' regular needs assessment practices with migrant's needs. Where there was such a model or process and a few regions promoted them, the other aspects of teaming seemed better, such as teacher and aide planning, assessment of inservice needs, and materials coordination or development. It should be noted that as this study was being conducted, the State was busy designing needs assessment instruments to be used during planning for the 1981-82 school year.

Recommendation. The State should clarify in its policy documents and funding guidelines how needs assessment information, and what kind, is to be used. The State should also clarify how the district and migrant education staff should team in terms of coordinating the migrant needs assessments with regular district planning activities. Instruments being recommended or mandated by the State should be accompanied by a strong inservice program from the State or regions. In the final analysis, however, the State should define exactly how the needs assessment information should be used, especially in relationship to funding, continuity of services, program planning, and instructional planning. Since needs assessment activities are so important, the State should also increase the strength of MAR as an effective method for making districts and regions accountable for completing and using the assessments.

6. Utilization of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)

Conclusion. The data tend to show that slightly over half of the respondents who are familiar with the MSRTS actually use the information it provides, and even then it is used simply to record services provided to the migrant student, and to determine the programs' funding levels for the next school year. The system is therefore not being used to provide a continuity of services for migrant students. The respondents generally rely on other information sources either to supplement or substitute the MSRTS data (such as the student's cumulative resource or profile). Reasons for utilizing other sources and not the MSRTS were that the data are incomplete, not received in a timely fashion, the coding has limited use, and the data are only somewhat useful or not useful in prescribing curriculum to a migrant student who is entering a new school. However, the health/medical forms are of greater use to the migrant staff particularly for identifying the student's health conditions, but not for remediating the problems by professional physicians or health careers.

The issue of utilizing the MSRTS data is difficult to deal with in a constructive way. It is a "catch-22" of sorts. That is, the system is used inconsistently. Time is being spent to gather, compile, and record data. But the data are used only to determine the funding for the next school year, and not to provide information about the migrant students. Given continued budget constraints, the allocation of time and resources to necessary services for migrant students will be crucial.

Recommendation. Since the MSRTS is a national system, it is difficult for California to take any unilateral steps towards devising a better, more efficient and effective system. However, the MSRTS usage should be redefined and reevaluated in order to have a ystem that can provide continuity to the migrant students' education and health services within minimum federal requirements. Without this reanalysis of the MSRTS, the system and its related costs (e.g. clerical time, delays,

incompleteness) are not warranted. In order to accomplish this task the State should pursue with the federal government the development of a system that is more relevant to the State educational needs and current composition and mobility of the target population. Since the MSRTS data have limited use, and since other information sources are used (see conclusion below), the most appropriate system should be a tracking system that can allow the students' new district to notify the district they moved from to acquire the students' cumulative profile and other relevant information. These suggestions may be modified according to the ideas provided in the recommendation below. There is some concern however that the cumulative records for migrant students are equally incomplete and its data are not timely in content and for immediate utilization. The migrant education program could set up a process for monitoring the paperwork involved in up-dating the cumulative records of migrant students rather than spending the clerical time updating the MSRTS forms. The migrant education program would then assume a cooperative role of quality control.

Conclusion. There are other information sources being used by regular and migrant education staff to provide a continuity of services for migrant students, namely, the student's cumulative record, teacher diagnostic techniques, and talking directly to the students are among the most used. In addition, since some respondents use the MSRTS to diagnose student needs there must be some information that, if identified, may be useful.

Recommendation. If the State is not successful in bargaining with the Federal government for altering the purpose and use of the MSRTS, the State may then want to identify (1) the specific MSRTS data that has been useful in the recent past to the local practitioners as well as (2) the types of information that are needed by teachers and medical/health personnel to provide supplementary services to migrant students. Intensive inservice training of regular and migrant staff should be instituted, that is geared towards these specific areas and

their usage. Priority can be placed on entering these specific data in the computer, which may consequently reduce MSRTS turnaround time. That is, focusing on the most needed and beneficial information may ensure that it can be utilized by the teaching and haelth practitioners, and that this valuable data are efficiently up-dated with complete information. Further, the identification of the most pertinent student health data may be a particularly difficult task as there are clearly more variations in a student's health status than in his/her educational status. The State may want to hired professional health personnel such as certified nurses rather than paraprofessional community and health aides to utilize the data.

Conclusion. The process of implementing the National Skills List is still in its early stages. Therefore, it may be predicted that similar situations that result from the overall MSRTS implementation may hamper an effective Skills List operation. In addition, even if some or most of the conflicts with the MSRTS are remedied, preconceived ideas about the MSRTS usefulness may still remain, and consequently, the Skills List may be taken with some skepticism.

Recommendation. When implementing or piloting the Skills List look closely at the above findings to guide its further development.

7. Identification and Recruitment

Conclusion. The overwhelming majority of aides and resource teachers responding to the summative questionnaires felt that the process was carried out very consistently with the manner intended by the State-level guidelines. The majority of these respondents feel they had been sufficiently well trained to carry out the process. Only minimal differences existed in the opinions of respondents from the two time frames. However it was the case that overall aides felt slightly less well prepared to implement this component than did resource teachers. Aides were also somewhat less confident of the accuracy with which the implementation was taking place.

Aides report having the greatest involvement with processes of identifying and enrolling migrant students. Resource teachers also report a somewhat lower level of involvement, followed by principals. For all three respondent groups only a moderate level of recruitment of new students was said to result from community or interdistrict contacts. Slightly more recruitment accrued as a result of contact with migrant families. Apparently the most common avenue whereby a new student is recruited for the program is his identification as a migrant student but some alert school site staff member. .Within districts a broad range of persons were indicated as contributing to the identification of eligible migrant students. These very definitely included non-migrant as well as migrant staff.

Recommendation. It is probably the case that a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with the timing and paperwork associated with identification and recruitment could be eliminated through improved communication. It appears that the combination of needs assessment, in-service training and identification and recruitment all taking place at the beginning of the school year combine to create severe constraints on the assistance that can be offered by resource teachers and aides at that time. Perhaps better coordination could be worked out to improve the situation in districts where it is perceived to be a problem. In addition, improved dissemination of information regarding the need for the process would probably benefit all those who work together to meet the educational needs of the migrant child.

8. Parent Involvement

Due to the limitations of the summative data discussed at the beginning of this component, only tentative conclusions are derived from the summative data. Also, this evaluator does not feel it is appropriate to make recommendations on these data. Therefore, these conclusions should be seen as hypothesis for further inquiry. What recommendations are made are derived from the formative study and from documentary analysis.

Conclusion. The procurement of reliable aggregative data on migrant parents and PACs is necessary in order to assess this aspect of the California Migrant Education Program. No such data currently exists, with the possible exception of data presented in this evaluation. The parent component is a complex component. Also, migrant parents in general may not be immediately accessible through routine research methodologies.

Recommendation. Further, more in-depth research needs to be conducted on California's migrant parents. The State should continue to explore alternative methodologies toward this end.

Conclusion. Considerable variability was found in most areas relating to migrant parent involvement.

Conclusion. One-third of the districts seem to have too much involvement by other non-migrant parent individuals in PAC affairs.

Conclusion. One-third of the district PACs have less than a simple majority of migrant parents.

Conclusion. Smaller districts, probably because of small size, limited internal resources and the apparent lack of clarity and specificity in parent guidelines and regulations from the outside, are in a difficult position in effectively developing PACs and involving migrant parents.

Recommendation. New specific and detailed guidelines should be written to include that districts with 300 or fewer ADA or 30 or less participating migrant students, and school sites with 20 or less migrant students be allowed a waiver for an alternate migrant parent advisory structure.

Conclusion. A noticeable number of PAC activities (e.g. meetings, minutes, and agendas) are conducted (written) in Spanish only.

Recommendation. In those instances when all persons present at PAC meetings understand a non-English language, meetings can be conducted exclusively in this language. However, since agendas and minutes may usually reach wider audiences, these should be bilingually written in English and at least this other non-English language.

Conclusion. PAC parents seem to be more informed about the migrant program than non-PAC parents. These active parents are either receiving training and/or are knowledgeable about most areas and aspects concerning the migrant education program.

Conclusion. Minor differences were observed between PAC and non-PAC parents with respect to attitudes to education and their children's education. The data shows, however, that these differences are not large enough to propose tentative conclusions.

Recommendation. The State should study in more depth the possible effects of PAC participation on parents in terms of general educational knowledge, and how they view their children's education.

Conclusion. Parent participation seems to have more emphasis on attendance at meetings, and less emphasis on their substantive utilization in design, implementation, and evaluation of local programs.

Conclusion. A noticeable number of non-PAC parents also appear to be either receiving training and/or may be knowledgeable about the basic goals of the program and how it generally works.

Conclusion. Parents that do not participate seem to do so because they feel uncomfortable in meetings, and because they are not adequately informed as to why it is important that they participate.

Conclusion. Frequency of family household moves does not appear to be a significant factor in migrant parent non-participation in PACs.

Conclusion. Language difficulties do not seem to be a significant factor in migrant parent non-participation in PACs.

9. Health and Supportive Services

Conclusion. The State Migrant Education Section does not have a person with adequate health or medical training heading this component, although there are some individuals with the administrative experience.

Recommendation. It is recommended that a person with proper credentials be hired to provide the leadership and direction needed for this component.

Conclusion. It was determined that there is a need for an official document which would specify minimal standards and operating procedures.

Recommendation. It is recommended that the revised version of Guidelines For Health Services, prepared by the State Health Steering Committee, be reviewed and adopted.

Conclusion. While this study did not undertake a cost effective analysis associated with the diverse administrative structures, it became clear after numerous interviews with district, region and State people, that migrant health clinics are not being fully utilized.

Recommendation. It is recommended that the utilization of migrant health clinics be investigated. A decision as to what to do can only be settled after it is determined if reasons for wider-utilization are legitimate or are merely a lack of procedural know-how.

Conclusion. Summative findings indicate that the Medical MSRTS is used by health aides and migrant nurses. However, formative findings indicate that doctors have little use for the Medical MSRTS.

Recommendation. It is recommended that further investigation be conducted to determine if this system is warranted since doctors make little use of it and since health aides and migrant nurses have other sources for the information needed.

10. Monitoring and Review (MAR)

Conclusion. Migrant and district staff favor regional MARs over State MARs, due perhaps to the increased amount of contact and informal feedback.

Recommendation. None.

Conclusion. Parents appear to be involved in some way in the MAR in about half the districts but only as additional people to be interviewed by the MAR teams. Procedures for how they are to participate in direct program evaluation are not clearly detailed.

Recommendation. Mechanisms need to be developed at all program levels for substantive inclusion of PAC parents in program evaluation. These procedures should be written up precisely and included as part of regulations and guidelines for the California Migrant Program.

Conclusion. Most of the resource teachers favor changing MAR generally so that it provides more "quality" feedback to their local program within a less formal structure. Also, combining compliance and quality within the same MAR process dilutes either one or both of these areas.

Recommendation. The State should continue to clarify and strengthen the compliance-oriented aspect of its MAR of regions and samples of districts. Regions should be encouraged to conduct their MAR visits to districts more on the basis of quality review, appraisal and feedback. The State should formally restructure the regional MARs exclusively on this quality basis, while leaving the compliance aspect to the State MAR. The State should also explore the potential benefits of making greater use of the Technical Assistance Centers (TAC) together with these visits by regions for formative (quality) feedback to local districts.

Conclusion. Most MAR team members appear to be qualified and to conduct themselves professionally and diplomatically during MAR visits This, however, does not sem to always be the case across all MAR members. Some may not be adequately prepared to perform MAR duties.

Recommendation. The State should devise a formal procedure for the training of consultants and/or others to participate in MAR. This plan should include at least the procedures for the MAR, the areas and items of the MAR compliance instruments, and protocol and conduct to be adhered to in the field visits. Assigned personnel should be at least adequately matched to the duties and responsibilities to be carried out in the MAR.

Conclusion. The MAR lacks legitimacy throughout the State at all levels. A prevalent view in the field is that "MAR has no teeth," and that regions and districts will "only get their hands slapped" if found out of compliance. As long as "political" subversion of or lack of consistent adherence to a legally mandated and officially established compliance process continues, both the objective effectiveness as well as the positive, credible perceptions based on this effectiveness, will continue to deteriorate.

Recommendation. The State should strengthen the MAR compliance process. MAR needs to abide by a formally established process for compliance assurance. In those cases where it is apparent in light of this formally established "show cause" process, that an LEA is not demonstrating "good will" toward compliance, formal fund "cutoff letters;" and, if necessary, eventual fund withdrawal or impoundment should be effectuated.

Conclusion. The timing of State and regional MARs is seen in the field as being in need of revision. These visits usually take place sometime after March. By that late date, regions and districts are not in practical positions to implement program changes for that school year.

Recommendation. Both State and regional MARs should take place throughout late October through November, and MAR visit calendars should be sent to regions and districts by no later than September 1.

Conclusion. There is currently no requirement that districts MAR their own migrant education programs. Districts tend to largely depend on State and regional MARs to tell them if they are in compliance. Beyond this, in most cases districts have no (and are not required to have a) way of knowing whether or not they are accomplishing their goals and objectives.

Recommendation. The State needs to revise the content of district service agreements with respect to evaluation responsibilities districts should have. This revision needs to be done along the lines of contractual agreements which encourage, structure, and require districts to play a significant role in monitoring objective and goal attainment for their local programs on an on-going basis.

Conclusion. The way the MAR is carried out across all regions appears to be varied and somewhat more complex than was expected at the start of this evaluation.

Recommendation. Further research needs to be conducted on the character of the relationships between districts and regions with respect to MAR process intricacies and impact on how districts incorporate or fail to incorporate regional and State MAR feedback and other findings.

11. Interstate and Interagency Coordination

Conclusion. There is a renewed impetus by the State Migrant Education Section to structure this component and begin to systematically pursue formal agreements and coordination.

Recommendation. This process of coordination and implementation should be wholeheartedly continued. In addition, it is strongly suggested the regional (and their participating districts) and direct-funded operating agencies under the direction of the State should pursue a similar course of action with local educational and service-oriented programs.

Conclusion. Bilingual education, vocational education, and special education are among the areas that coordination, particularly at the State level, is inconsistent.

Recommendation. The Migrant Education Section should begin formal meetings and planning sessions with the departments that implement these programs. The development and completion of coordinative places should be extended to regional and direct-funded operating agencies in order to enhance programmatic efforts for migrant students at the local level.

Conclusion. Coordination with local health progrms is working well. Local school district and region identification of appropriate health and social welfare agencies is effective.

Recommendation. Continue this effort and to promote effective supplementary health services for migrant students.

Conclusion. Limited coordination efforts exist between direct-funded districts and regionally-administered districts that have feeder relationships. Identification and recruitments, articulation of curriculum, and special educational projects are among the most noticeable.

Recommendation. Formal coordination should be extended to direct-funded districts by regional operating agencies and vice-versa.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation. Since migrant education is a supplementary compensatory education program, it is necessary that the program coordinate and ultimately integrate its services with all existing programs while keeping the independence needed to ensure that migrant students receive appropriate services. The migrant education program can play a vital role in promoting effective coordination of services for migrant students especially at the district level where economic resources may be increasingly limited over time.

12. Fund Allocations

Conclusion. The funding process is fairly straightforward, with the State and the regions in almost total control of the funding local districts receive.

Conclusion. Although some regions seem to weigh local needs more than others, there seems to be unequal funding across districts in every region.

Recommendation. State policy needs to be rewritten to include a uniform process for funding to be equalized according to needs; for example, a district with a strong ESL or bilingual component may not need as much migrant funding as one without such a program.

Conclusion. Issues identified by this study suggest several needs that would impact funding decisions; the following seem to have the greatest implications:

- Need for more instructional aides; paperwork load and low salaries are problems.
- Need for assistance (such as MESTs) to coordinating resource teachers; coordination, and promotion activities leave little time for instructional improvement activities.
- Need for more, or better, migrant instructional materials.
- Need for more, or better, training in the instructional areas.
- Need for more, or better, systematic assessment of student progress.
- Need in secondary schools, for more use of migrant certificated staff (such as MESTs).

- Need to increase the utility, and reduce the burden, of the MSRTS documentation system.

Recommendation. The State should derive a process for prioritizing these and other findings of this study, and develop a step-wise action plan for any changes requiring funding decisions.

13. Information and Dissemination

In the process of identifying, preparing, and packaging innovative programs or practices for exemplary status, this component and the CEMIC seem to be accomplishing their goals. As described earlier, in this discussion, the CEMIC seems to utilize almost every means of information diffusion available. However, perhaps one of the most important CEMIC and migrant education system-internal processes for dissemination does not seem to not be working effectively.

Conclusion. In varying degrees, there appears to be information breakdowns at every key juncture in this migrant education delivery system: between the State consultant unit and operating agencies, between CEMIC and operating agencies, and particularly between operating agencies and local districts.

Recommendation. At least two things could be done to counteract the last two of these disjunctures (CEMIC to operating agency and operating agency to district). First, since this information relay is the responsibility of the operating agency, the agency should have appropriate and consistent representation at CEMIC functions. Second, this means CEMIC representatives should be adequately prepared, capable, and responsible for relay of information to local areas, and that the State and operating agencies individually or collectively delineate guidelines for the uniform and consistent communication of appropriate information to these local areas.

Recommendation. The State should publish a single monthly newsletter with sections on/by/for significant migrant education components, areas, audiences, or publics (e.g., operating agencies, parents, aides, classroom teachers, exemplary programs, Mini-Corps, etc.). This newsletter should also be printed bilingually in English and Spanish.

Conclusion. Formative interviews tended to show a lack of uniform and consistent information by State migrant education consultants across and within sites.

Recommendation. The State should set up a process within the Migrant Education Section for the ongoing exchange of information among the consultants. The State should ensure that all consultants participate in periodic staff inservices, especially as new rules, procedures, or other tools are adopted by the California Migrant Education Program.

14. Mini-Corps

Conclusion. Mini-corps operates much like a special project within the migrant education program. The staff conduct a comprehensive annual evaluation which has always provided much useful information. The evaluation was, by necessity and as mandated, far less comprehensive although unique in its third-party perspective. While the sample sizes represented are too small to justify a series of specific recommendations, the combination of the formative and summative data collection efforts do seem to point toward some general conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendation. Generally the program seems extremely worthy of continuation and expansion. It appears to be meeting the needs of those involved with the program at all levels: migrant school children, Mini-corps trainees (themselves migrant students) as well as teachers, parents and school administrators.

Conclusion. There has been some discussion recently that the position of instructional aide is insufficient in some situations to meet the supplementary educational needs of migrant children. It is likely that if the Mini-corps program were to grow that the trainees placed in the classrooms would possess the additional training and expertise required in many situations.

Recommendation. Given the salaries, supervisory time, and inservice training which combine to support the positions of instructional aides it is possible that the training and placement of Mini-corps aides is equally cost-effective. It is recommended that this possibility be considered for further study.

In many cases the expansion of the Mini-corps program has been limited by either problems in establishing relationships with local community colleges or difficulty in recruiting or paying team leaders or instructors to work with the trainees. If these problems could be overcome it is likely that the impact of the program could be considerably greater and it would appear many subgroups within the migrant community would benefit.

15. Recommendations Regarding Organization, Policy, and Administration

Recommendations were included in the sections covering each of the components. It was decided, however, that recommendations relating to organization, policy, and administration, which often cut across components, should be presented separately, and differently. This section attempts to provide those kinds of recommendations.

Organizations. A three-level organization seems warranted. However, the policy governing how the organization operates needs to be dramatically improved. In addition, the administration of the program needs to be changed at all levels.

1. Since the middle-level agencies (regions) have no direct authority over districts other than migrant staff, their part in the organization should be much more service-oriented rather than compliance-related. If organized appropriately, the middle level can act as a quality control function for the program which is both flexible to district needs and compliant with State and Federal policy.

2. It is recommended that the service load of the middle-level agencies be equitably distributed so that districts can count on reasonable levels of support. The State should decide what constitutes a reasonably sized area for each agency to serve, taking into consideration migrant student populations and geographic limitations.

3. It is recommended that the district level be organized such that each district is clearly responsible and accountable for its own migrant program. Whatever agreement exists between a district and a middle-level agency or the State should be for well-defined contracted services.

4. The State Migrant Education Section should be retained. It should be maintained, however, under the supervision outside or above

the milieu of the consolidated application programs. As long as the Federal regulations recognize it as a categorical program, and as long as the student population retains its language and mobility needs, the State should protect program advocacy.

5. The State Migrant Education Section itself should be reorganized. Staff should be assigned only to components that require administrative or technical attention beyond that required by the districts or middle-level agencies. Staff should be assigned to major aspects of any new policy statements to assure they are carried out. Staff should also be assigned to certain areas of the State corresponding to the organizational structure of the middle-level agencies in order to answer telephone inquiries. All of these assignments should be orchestrated in terms of any new policy or administrative decisions.

Policy. The State should exercise leadership through the development, dissemination, and maintenance of new migrant education policy statements. The organization of the program, therefore, must be altered to reflect the essence of this new policy. The administration of the program should be changed accordingly so that the policy can be met.

1. The State should develop rules and regulations that meet all Federal requirements and at the same time merge appropriately with existing State policies. These rules and regulations are needed immediately.

2. The State rules and regulations should clarify the State's position on the definition of supplementary services, recognizing that if a district does not provide a service that benefits migrant students, it is appropriate to provide a substitute service.

3. The regulations should list the exact requirements related to an adequate level of district commitment to the operation of a migrant

program, including specifics of how the migrant program and regular program should work together. Such things as integrating the planning, needs assessment, and staff development activities should be defined.

4. The regulations should indicate how planning and needs assessment functions relate to funding allocations. Districts with strong bilingual or ESL programs already may not need as much help from migrant education as those without them, even if both have the same number of migrant students. Identification, recruitment, and continuity of service requirements should be maintained in all districts on a per student basis.

5. The regulations should outline in detail how and when the districts will receive funds, carefully considering the time districts need to merge migrant planning with other district planning. Since districts begin serious planning for the next school year in March, and attempt to have most of their staffing assignments made by May or June, the timelines for State allocation of funds should be adjusted accordingly. This may be difficult, as timelines are somewhat dependent upon Federal allocations.

6. The regulations should clarify the compliance and operative aspects of the MAR function, indicating clearly the steps that will be taken if a district is found out of compliance, including a withdrawal of funds. They should list when and how the MAR will occur. And, they should prioritize the most critical requirements; and among them should be some important program quality requirements such as evidence of at least three acceptable methods of following the progress of student achievement, evidence of criteria being used for hiring qualified migrant staff, evidence of joint planning and needs assessment between the migrant program and regular programs of the district, evidence of substantive parent involvement in the design, implementaton, and evaluation of the program.

7. The regulations should clarify the degree of parental involvement at all levels that is realistic given the Federal requirements that parents help design, implement, and evaluate the program. In addition, a reasonable degree of migrant parent involvement in the regular district program should be specified. More study of parent involvement is needed.

8. The regulations should integrate the activities of interagency coordination with health and special counseling services such that the services available from the local communities are adequately tapped.

9. The roles of middle-level agencies should be specified, including how the districts contract with the agencies for those services. The level of responsibility given to those agencies should take into consideration that they do not have any legislated authority over school districts. If they play a role in the allocation of funds, it should be clarified uniformly across agencies how it is to be done, and how district level needs assessment and planning activities are to affect funding levels.

10. The role of the State should be specified in great detail. It should be clear that the State Migrant Education Section administers the migrant program in California under the newly stated policy. The relationship between the State and the middle-level agencies should be specified, including how the agencies will be held accountable under the MAR. The relationship between the State and the districts should be specified, again including the MAR requirements.

11. The MSRTS usage should be redefined, at least in keeping with minimum Federal requirements. It is essential that the State bargain with the Federal government in doing so. The system should be used primarily as a tracking system for migrant students. The system should be streamlined such that as soon as a student enters a district the previous district is notified to send the students' cumulative record. Coding of academic and interest information on the MSRTS is no

longer warranted. If the students' cumulative record is organized appropriately, the coding of health information may not be needed either. The MSRTS should be maintained primarily through efforts of the middle-level agencies with very minimal record transfer directly between districts. If, however, the present level of effort with MSRTS is maintained, the State should execute a strong training program on information usage to justify the continued cost of the vast recordkeeping activities.

12. The methods of identifying, evaluating, and disseminating exemplary programs should be specified. The middle-level agencies should be used extensively to conduct these activities for their districts. The State should coordinate the activities of the middle-level agencies. Two different exemplary lists are recommended: (a) the first list should be provided routinely as an exemplary project or product is made available for appraisal; (b) the second list should include only those projects or products that meet certain minimum criteria for usage. Those criteria should be routinely distributed to districts so they can evaluate interesting projects or products before they reach the second list.

13. The rules and regulations should clearly define the elements to be included in any written agreements between the State, middle-level agencies, and districts. Those definitions should include adequate reference to State guidelines on any program component; but they should not take ownership away from the districts as to how they are to operate their migrant program.

14. The regulations should clarify how the migrant program is to be evaluated. The Statewide program should be evaluated annually, with each evaluation covering an entire school year. Districts participating in the evaluation should be rotated so that about one-third of them are involved each year, and so that they need to participate only every three years. It is expected that all of the middle-level agencies will be evaluated each year. The evaluation should include an annual description

of student outcomes, such as attendance, mobility, achievement in the basic skills, and drop-out rates. It should also include a description of any program processes that the State deems important for that specific school year. It is recommended that formative and summative approaches be maintained as the basic evaluation methodology.

Administration. It is highly recommended that the State exercise strong leadership by demonstrating a "tough line" regarding program participation, but recognizing the districts' need to conduct their own educational programs. The need for program advocacy remains, and the State must administer their program keeping that in mind. However, the most effective advocacy may be obtained by following through and holding districts and agencies accountable for how they operate their programs.

1. The administrative link between the State and the middle-level agencies should be clarified, including how and when State MAR visitations will take place.

2. The administrative link between the State and the districts should be clarified, again including how and when State MAR visitations will take place.

3. The administrative link, if any, between the middle-level agencies should be clarified, especially in terms of recordkeeping and quality control functions. Compliance-oriented MAR visits to the districts by the middle agencies is not recommended. A quality control function should be developed instead to provide systematic reporting of helpful information back to the districts for the purpose of continued program improvement.

4. A funding allocation schedule should be developed, and followed, based on the availability of funding information from the Federal government. All final funding decisions Statewide, if possible, should be

completed by the first of August each year; initial funding information dissemination should begin, if possible, during March or April of each year.

5. The organization of the State Migrant Education Section should facilitate all aspects of the State's desired administrative linkage to the field. Administrative assignments to components, middle agencies, and districts seems desirable. As with the agencies and districts, the Migrant Education Section should be monitored and reviewed in terms of the goals and objectives related to those assignments. It is recommended that members of the Administrative Branch of the State Department of Education conduct an annual MAR of the Migrant Education Section.

6. It is recommended that the Migrant Education Section, hence, the Director of Migrant Education, remain linked to the Executive Branch rather than being included with the programs within the consolidated application. The district needs of the migrant students, their mobility and their difficulty with language and basic skills, make it imperative that the migrant education program maintain a stance of advocacy. However, among the goals and objectives set forth for the section should be those related to coordination with other programs, especially Title I and bilingual programs.

7. It is recommended that the Migrant Education Section use more middle agency and district personnel during the State MAR visitations. This will offset the burden of State personnel, add an adequate representation and objectivity to the MAR, increase program knowledge among both middle level and district personnel, and create a more cooperative spirit surrounding the MAR process. The State, however, should not retreat if a district or middle agency is found out of compliance. The backbone of State leadership will be its skillful administration of the MAR process.

8. The State should provide concise specifications for each job position in the migrant education program. These specifications

should have two components: (1) the specified needs or reasons for the position; and (2) the basic activities or tasks for the position. A district or agency should clarify the need for filling the position around the needs and reasons, and monitor the person's fulfillment of the position in relationship to the activities or tasks. Special attention should be given to the administrative, supervisory, and coordinating activities or tasks, especially at the district level. The State should clearly specify the degree to which resource teachers should be given such activities, so that they can participate in instructional planning, conduct staff training, perform needs assessment, develop materials, and provide technical assistance.

Appendix

Advisory Panel Members

Advisory Panel

Composition of the Panel. The study's Advisory Panel was formed to provide the RMC evaluation staff with different perspectives on migrant education, to review the work of the study, to give constructive input as to the direction of the study, and to assist with the interpretation of the evaluation results. The Panel was composed of various levels of migrant education practitioners, district and county superintendents, legislative advocate for migrant education, an evaluation specialist, and a migrant parent. The following is the list of the panel members:

Carlos Bowker--President, California State Migrant Parent Advisory Committee

Susana Halfon--Legislative Advocate, California Rural Legal Assistance

Ken Martinez--President, A.S.K. Associates

Richard P. Mesa--District Superintendent, Milpitas Unified School District (Region I)

Carlos Meza--Migrant Resource Teacher, Winters Unified School District

Fred Montoya--Regional Director of Migrant Education (Region III)

Gerald Rosander--County Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County (Region IX)

Helene Thome--Manager, Migrant Education Office, Pajaro Valley Unified School District (Direct-funded)

The meetings were also attended by representatives of OPER (Tom Sachse and David Gordon), the State Migrant Education Section (Manuel Alfaro and Leo Lopez), and consultants to the State Department of Education (Iris Berke and Robert Bush). The diverse composition of those attending the meetings allowed for quality discussion from the various perspectives.